

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6991

by German imperialism, which forced Masaryk to seek a unified Europe over the grave of the Austrian and Hungarian monarchy.

For Masaryk, European federation was not some opportunistic scheme of the moment, but an organic outgrowth of Czech policy, a policy which had striven to transform the Hapsburg monarchy into a federalized structure of free and self-governing peoples, a federation which could have been the model for all of Europe. Federalization of Austria had, after all, been the goal of lifelong efforts of Masaryk's teacher and great predecessor, Palacky, who as a politician and historian had analyzed the history of Europe, as seen from its very center, with a thoroughness few others possessed. And when Masaryk found himself within the focal area of European politics during the First World War, he—despite his longing for the liberation of Czechs and Slovaks from centuries-long oppression—did not forget "mother" Europe. He conceived of the liberation of his own people as a useful and necessary step on the road to a voluntary and free European unification. Masaryk's enemies reproach him for the "balkanization" of Europe. Yet, the Second World War did not originate in the liberated nations, but in dictatorial states. Masaryk wrote, on page 436 of the Czech edition of his "Svetova Revoluce" (world revolution), that "the United States of Europe ceases to be a utopia." He clearly defined in this book his faith in a unified Europe.

Masaryk did not believe that nationalism and internationalism excluded each other, but that they were complementary. In "The New Europe" he said: "Nations are the natural organs of humanity. Humanity is not supernatural, it is the organization of individual nations. If, therefore, individual nations struggle for their independence and attempt to break up states of which they have heretofore been parts, that is not a fight against internationality and humanity, but a fight against aggressors, who misuse states for the purposes of leveling them and enforcing political uniformity. Humanity does not tend to uniformity, but to unity; it will be the liberation of nations which will make possible the organic association, the federation of nations, of Europe, and of all mankind." Let us take note of the contemporary appropriateness of those words. The present central-European struggle against oppressors is a fight for European federation. And the struggle against the phenomenon which Masaryk had termed "uniformity" is the fight against the concept of satellite Communist leveling.

In all his prewar works, Masaryk pointed to the twilight of sovereignty for small and large states alike and to the need for wider political entities and international organizations. However, Masaryk did not connect state sovereignty with power, with the might of individual states after Machiavelli's fashion. He related sovereignty to the state's internal structure, saying that it was only an absolutist state that could perhaps attain full sovereignty, never a democratic one. Masaryk knew that in the case of even a large state full sovereignty could not be practiced except at the cost of inhuman isolationism. When reading his works, one gets the feeling that he was forecasting the erection of the Iron Curtain and of the Berlin wall, which are nothing but inhuman and despicable means for the preservation of Soviet sovereignty and Soviet fear of a Europe that is going through the natural process of unification. For what is the fundamental basis of Masaryk's concept of a world revolution? It was the democratization of Europe and of the world. And, indeed, this democratization which, in the past, prevented European unification by force has in the 20th century, grown so strong that nothing but violence and brute force can stay the unifying process. Masaryk consistently

fought against unification by violence and for an organization of free nations which would be led by freemen.

Masaryk wrote a work which, in its English version, was titled "The Spirit of Russia." I do not consider this translation especially fortuitous, as the original name reads Russia and Europe, and the work is devoted to an analysis of the interactions of Europe and Russia. We find, within the whole context of this word, that Masaryk did not consider Russia as a part of Europe. Better, he thought of her as a special sociological, ethnic, and historical unit. He obviously did not see the border dividing Russia and Europe as set upon the Elbe. The greatest tragedy of our time is that the peoples which Masaryk helped to liberate, so they could form an integral part of a unified Europe, are today subjected by Russia. It is a tragedy that 100 million inhabitants of central and eastern Europe are unable to join the 160 million or so of west Europeans. Europe, thus unified, would have a population exceeding the 200 million of the U.S.S.R., to mention just the demographic aspect.

Europe will never be truly unified so long as unification remains restricted to Western Europe. Military reasons alone demand that the 550,000 square miles of central and eastern, non-Russian, Europe be joined with the 450,000 square miles of Western Europe; a Western Europe which is too shallow for countering the Soviet onslaught through its own means alone. In terms of geopolitics and history, central Europe is a part of Europe. This fact, which was so clear to Masaryk and which was so masterfully documented in his work, should not be forgotten today when we rejoice in the progress of the nascent federated Europe, lest our joy be short lived.

Twenty-five years have passed since Masaryk's death. It is not Masaryk's dreams which are becoming a reality—for Masaryk was no dreamer. It is rather that the seed which he planted is at last sprouting through the soils of the concealed history of Europe; a history which Masaryk understood so well. Even we may not be dreamers as we put our faith today in the certainty of his idea and as we cherish hopes that another seed, of even greater promise, is germinating below the surface of present-day political events, a seed which will yield a harvest more joyous still in the form of a Europe undivided, a Europe actually unified, a Europe free, and a Europe truly new.

To John W. Anderson, of Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, my district, Lake County, of Indiana, has one of the Nation's outstanding creative citizens in John W. Anderson, the president of the Anderson Co., of Gary, makers of automotive equipment.

His long experience in distribution and his concern with the trend toward oppressive retail monopoly led Mr. Anderson to the pioneering of the movement on behalf of quality stabilization of trademarked products. I am proud to be the first of many sponsors of the quality stabilization bill in this Congress.

Mr. Anderson's determined leadership on behalf of the consumer, the small

businessman, and all ethical resellers, was recently saluted by Sid McKay, himself a small businessman of Los Angeles and an owner of McKay's Prescription Pharmacy there. Of Mr. Anderson, the president of Quality Brands Associates of America, Mr. McKay wrote:

You have made a true, all-out effort and a "thank you" just doesn't fit here because it just could not be loud enough, or long enough, to be heard enough.

Your energy has emphasized the weakness and apathy of too many of us, and for that, I am truly sorry.

Mr. McKay's keen and incisive analysis of the quality stabilization bill, and his appeal to all Members of this Congress to enact it quickly, is most deserving of your close attention:

FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT

As you are well aware, a great number of words have been written, perhaps even more have been spoken, on the merits of Senate Joint Resolution 159, the Quality Stabilization Act, also referred to as House Joint Resolution 636, the quality stabilization bill. It is possible that the opposition to this proposed legislation has been equally eloquent and emphatic. However, I am confident that decisions resulting in support, or in opposition, by the individual Members of Congress, are determined by the weighing of facts, rather than mail. Frankly, if our positions were reversed (and that shouldn't happen to you or to Congress) and I were deluged with letters and telegrams, I might say to myself, "To hell with all of this advice. I will use the judgment attributed to me, when I was elected to this office." Neither did you solicit my advice, nor will I offer it. The following comments are intended as an expression of opinions, based on the experience of one individual, owner and operator of one small business, a retail pharmacy. This enterprise does enjoy and share, one distinction. It is one of 50,000 independently owned and operated retail pharmacies throughout the entire United States, according to statistics supplied by the 1960 census.

This small business employs five full-time employees, other than the owners, and during the past fiscal year \$49,000 was paid out in wages, from annual gross sales of \$190,000 and, after deducting all costs of operation and all taxes, the net profit was \$1,548.72. This profit was possible only because of a pricing policy based on so-called minimum fair trade retail prices. Any alternative method of pricing without stability, regardless of the wishful thinking of well intentioned economists, would result in the elimination of this business enterprise—and more important and more unfortunate—a large number of other businesses, in the same category or similar status.

According to the manufacturer a legal right to exercise a protective control over the retail value of his product, as outlined by and in, the Quality Stabilization Act, should give reasonable and fair assurance of costs and profits to those concerned in the transition of the product, from the manufacturer to the consumer. This should also serve as encouragement and incentive for expansion in production, and attendant increased employment. In competitive business enterprise any abuse of this right, would be impractical and unprofitable. Sound business principles have never been associated with evil business practices, whether it be a huge shopping center or a small store on Main Street, United States of America.

Creativity, as applied to opportunity for the individual in business enterprise, as applied to the opportunity of creating employment for others, as applied to the opportunity to be self-employed and self-support-

A6992

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 21

ing, ranks equally in importance with the opportunity to paint a portrait, to author a book, or sculpture a statue. Permit me one quote attributed to philosopher-author Arnold Toynbee, "To give a fair chance to potential creativity is a matter of life and death for any society." Small business, without this fair chance to survive in our society, is facing death.

This, I believe—and because I believe, I ask for your most serious consideration of the Quality Stabilization Act. I am extremely hopeful that such consideration will result in your support.

Respectfully,

SEN McKAY.

Cuba
Soviet Domination Reaches Into Every Phase of Cuban Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate—in its good judgment—adopted Senate Joint Resolution 230, expressing the determination of the United States with respect to Cuba.

Because of the significance of a Red foothold so close to our own Nation, it is important that we stay as well apprised as possible of the processes and progress of Communist domination over the Cuban people.

The Milwaukee Journal of September 16 published an article entitled "Soviet Domination Now Reaches Into Every Phase of Cuban Life."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET DOMINATION NOW REACHES INTO EVERY PHASE OF CUBAN LIFE—OBSERVER SEES LITTLE HOPE OF PRYING REDS FROM BASE EXCEPT BY ARMED INVASION

(By William L. Ryan)

Moscow today just about owns Cuba—lock, stock, barrel, and beard.

Inexorably, Soviet communism is closing its steel grip. Challenging the United States in the sensitive Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere, Moscow has given the world a lesson in imperialism.

When the Russians colonize, they colonize for good. Short of armed invasion, there seems little hope of prying the Communists out of a base 90 miles from U.S. shores.

The Soviet takeover will be complete when Fidel Castro is shoved aside, along with his 26th of July movement revolutionaries. This will be a slow and cautious process, but signs of party conflict are clear.

CASTRO LOSES SUPPORT

Daily, Castro appears more and more in the role of a bumbling and confused man, loudly demanding everything his own way, but bowing to what he now calls the "collective leadership." He has lost much popular support. Havana reports suggest only 20 percent of the people back him now. That is much more than the percentage backing the old guard Communists, but they do not need popular support. They have their tight, disciplined, spy ridden organization—and they have Moscow on their side.

The Communists are patient. They can wait until popular disillusion and economic chaos make Castro no longer important. They are letting him shoulder the blame for Cuba's internal woes. They are letting his entourage of "new Communists"—men like Ernesto Guevara; Fidel's brother, Raul Castro, and others of his Sierra Maestra revolution following—hang themselves with ropes fashioned of their own confusion. The time will come when Castro can safely be removed.

A close examination of just how tightly the Soviet Communist grip has seized the Pearl of the Antilles produces a sense of shock. From documents and official regime statements, and from reports of diplomatic travelers, this picture emerges of a Cuba as tightly bound to Moscow as is Bulgaria:

THE ARMED FORCES

The rag-tag 26th of July army of bearded romantics who marched into Havana January 2, 1959, is no more. In its place is a force of about 300,000, made up of more than 50,000 trained regulars and a heavily armed militia. The training is by Communist bloc officers. The equipment is modern. The discipline is strict and Soviet style. The facilities are installed and expanded by Russians and east Europeans.

Even now the army has political commissars, carbon copies of the politruk officers of east bloc armies, assigned to nail down party authority. One group of 750 revolutionary instructors was graduated this month from a special school and is being infused into the army. Castro says their mission is to "teach the class struggle character of the revolution" to the army.

THE ECONOMY

Moscow owns the economy. Fantastic numbers of trucks and other vehicles pour in from the Red bloc, each batch making Cuba more dependent upon Soviet petroleum shipments.

Imports for 1962 from the U.S.S.R. include: Wheat flour, cereal grains, edible oils, canned, frozen and cured meats, condensed milk, baby foods, rice, butter, lard, peas, canned fish, beans, potatoes, fertilizers, rayon and other textiles, superphosphates, trucks, jeeps, buses, tractors, a petroleum tanker, rice harvesters, machine tools, power shovels, graders, bulldozers, compressors, rolled steel, tinplate, steel pipes, cast iron, cardboard, raw materials for soap manufacture, cement, lubricants, ammonium nitrate and even containers for sugar.

Czechoslovakia is sending textile yarns, artificial leather, steel products, chemicals, glass, foodstuffs, newsprint, buses, tractors, trucks and tow trucks, machinery and tools, diesel motors, electronic units. Red China sends soybeans, rice, canned meat, medicines. Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Poland send food. The bloc also sends swarms of technical assistants.

Cuba's sugar goes to the bloc in part payment. The sugar industry, always the backbone of the Cuban economy, is dominated completely by the Soviet bloc. Bloc equipment runs the refineries.

AGRICULTURE

In a speech to farmers in May 1961, Castro ridiculed the idea that farms would be collectivized. He said: "The revolution would never do such a foolish thing * * *. Although this is a Socialist revolution, the land will not be socialized. * * * If a farmer prefers to keep his bit of land, then the revolution will never try to socialize it."

An agrarian reform law a year before had broken up big holdings for distribution. Peasants, in order to make any economic sense of their production, had to form cooperatives, especially in such fields as sugar, coffee, rice, and cattle raising. The number of cooperatives grew to 622.

As late as 2 months ago, Castro repeated the pledge against collectivization. Then he

changed his mind—or it was changed for him.

As in other Communist lands, production quotas are laid down. Norms are set for cattle and livestock reproduction, and, as in the other lands, the big drawback is that the cattle cannot read instructions. The economy is prey to all the ills that afflict other Communist agriculture.

LABOR

Regimentation is on the Soviet model. The workman is subject to production quotas. "Socialist emulation," the speedup device invented by Moscow, was formally introduced April 16. The speedup worker is known as "distinguished worker."

The Cuban workers' central directs 25 national unions and automatically approves what the regime orders. As in other Communist countries, it does not represent the labor force, but the state. Workers are subjected to lectures, work discipline, warning about such things as a "formal bureaucratic attitude." They are punished for lateness or absenteeism. Directors are punished for failing to make quotas or for distorting figures.

Cards were issued August 15 to all workers over 18. The information about each worker took up 15 pages. Fourteen pages went into regime files. The worker got the 15th as his card. He cannot work without it.

Before the Castro era, few women in Cuba did heavy labor. Now they—along with workers, students and even aged people—are dragooned into "Socialist Sundays." They are supposed to be volunteers to save sugar crops. Women also cut hay, pick coffee and cotton, and do other agricultural labor.

YOUTH

Cuba now has a Communist Youth Union, with the same cell structure which marks the Soviet Young Communist League (Komsomol). Its purpose, said Castro, is to "mold youth into a Communist attitude * * * war against intrigue * * * against gossip, against rumors behind the back * * * to correct errors of others."

There is an organization committee controlling all activities of students in both school and vacation time. It guards against absenteeism, watches student unions, mobilizes students for work in the field, provides monitors to watch teachers, presides over sports and all student activities.

INTERNAL ENEMIES

All the ills of an emerging Communist regime afflict Cuba: Shortages, hoarding, black marketing, clandestine slaughter of livestock. Those who complain are labeled enemies of the people.

In a Catholic country, the regime goes slowly about cracking down on religion. Castro proclaims religious freedom. But church activities are curtailed and confined inside church buildings.

The regime carries on a gigantic indoctrination campaign. Hundreds of thousands of Communist manuals are distributed. Communist Boss Blas Roca's "Fundamentals of Socialism in Cuba" was distributed in 700,000 copies—1 for each 10 or less persons.

THE OUTLOOK

On the surface, Castro still does not appear to have lost any of his authority but that is only a surface appearance. The old guard Reds weave their power web carefully, move slowly. The time is approaching for the final phase of envelopment. When Castro's presence is no longer necessary, when he has taken all the blame for Cuba's economic disaster, he can safely be put aside, and that will be managed by men responsible to Moscow.

Right now, Roca, Carlos Rodriguez, and other old guard Communists seem to be spending much of their time trying to outfox Castro. The Premier appears to flounder more and more in a morass of mixed-up

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6993

ideology. Is he being insidiously undermined by the old guard? There is much evidence to suggest that he is, and he seems resentful.

When Castro finally is shoved aside it will be small consolation for the United States. It will mean Moscow's domination is complete.

Castro sounded a little bitter about things in a recent speech.

"A revolution is not as easy thing," he said. "It is easy in books. It is difficult in reality."

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, September 20, 1962:

FAMILIAR STORY

The anguished cries which have greeted the \$1.124 billion cut in foreign aid would be more impressive if they did not have such a familiar ring.

President Kennedy says this slash by the House Appropriations Committee, deepest of any year, is "irresponsible" and a "threat to free world security." Secretary of State Rusk says our foreign policy objectives will be "greatly endangered" unless Congress votes the full \$4.752 billion requested by the President.

We are not so sure. For the record on foreign aid, and former statements made with respect to it, do not inspire unlimited confidence.

Last year, for example, the subcommittee handling this matter recommended \$3.357 billion for the mutual security program. Secretaries Rusk and McNamara said a workable program could not be maintained under the cut proposed by the subcommittee. So Congress finally appropriated \$3.9 billion. But only \$3.198 billion was spent during the year—\$716 million less than Congress appropriated and, believe it or not, \$159 million less than the amount recommended by the subcommittee—the recommendation which brought the protest from Messrs. Rusk and McNamara.

All of this is taken from this year's report of the subcommittee headed by Representative PASSMAN, of Louisiana, and adopted by the full committee. As far as we know it is an accurate report. And it shows other things.

The President's budget requests for foreign aid are sent to Congress in January. Not until 2 months later are foreign aid officials ready to testify in support of their requests, and even then they cannot justify many items. Does this mean that the President's budget figures are mere guesses? During this year's hearings it was established that 101 of the 113 nations of the world have been, are or will be recipients of aid from the United States since the end of World War II. By any standard, that is covering a lot of territory. Finally, it is estimated that there was \$6.712 billion in the foreign aid "pipeline" at the end of fiscal 1962. We realize that this money is committed. But the 1962 pipeline is almost \$2 billion more than the 1960 figure. And this suggests to us that Congress has been appropriating money faster than it can be spent. It also raises doubts in our mind that Mr. PASSMAN, his

critics to the contrary, really is bent on wrecking the foreign aid program.

Perhaps this year's cut is too deep—we do not know. If so, if this can be shown, some of the money should be restored. The restriction which would ban aid to Poland and Yugoslavia should be knocked out on a point of order. This matter was decided earlier in the session and, furthermore, it is legislation which has no place in an appropriation bill. On the whole, however, we think the committee did a creditable job. And we also believe its final action was an accurate reflection of the temper of the country.

Address by Vice Adm. H. A. Yeager, U.S. Navy, at the Christening and Launching Ceremonies of the U.S.S. "Vancouver"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, members of my family were honored to be present at the christening and launching of the U.S.S. *Vancouver* at the New York Naval Shipyard.

Adm. H. A. Yeager, commander amphibious force, U.S. Pacific Fleet, gave the major address at the ceremony. He discussed the role of the new class of ships—of which *Vancouver* is the second—and the role of our great amphibious forces in keeping the peace in all parts of the globe.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Admiral Yeager be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY VICE ADM. H. A. YEAGER, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER, AMPHIBIOUS FORCE, U.S. PACIFIC FLEET, AT THE LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. "VANCOUVER" (LPD 2), NEW YORK NAVAL SHIPYARD, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1962

We meet here today to christen and launch a new ship of the U.S. Navy. This is a happy occasion for all of us. With this ceremony we take the first step in giving life to the creation of the skilled minds and hands of the planners, designers, and craftsmen. And with this ceremony, we assign a name to the ship and wish her good luck as she first enters her natural home—the waters of the great oceans of the world.

I know that as we gaze upon this ship we have our separate thoughts. The men who designed and built her look with pride and satisfaction on a job well done. Those who will serve in her, examine her lines and configuration with a professional eye to the tasks ahead. And those of us who see this ship as an important addition to the naval power of the United States, view her with patriotic pride as a symbol of the determination of the American people that, come what may, this Nation and this people shall remain forever free.

The name this ship is to bear is a most fitting one. The beautiful city of Vancouver in the great State of Washington is the oldest permanent settlement of our Pacific Northwest.

Vancouver was the center of the pioneering movement of our people into that area,

and there were established the first industries and the first school in the Northwest.

It is also fitting that this ship bear the name Vancouver because in that city, more than a century ago, was built the first sea-going craft to be constructed in the Northwest. Vancouver was also the place where the first steamboat to enter the Pacific Ocean made her first trip under steam.

In naming the ship *Vancouver*, we also honor the great English navigator, whose historic survey of the northwest coast of the continent contributed so much to opening the area for development.

And so the name Vancouver represents many of the finest traditions of our Nation's history which should be, and will be, a part of this ship.

But today we look forward. This is a ship of the future. Those who conceived of this new design, those who drew her lines, and those who are building her, have had the future in mind.

She is the second ship of her type to be built. She follows the first of her class, U.S.S. *Raleigh*, which was commissioned here just a week ago.

These ships represent hard-earned experience in the field of amphibious warfare, but they represent also a vision of the future needs of the Navy. For this ship is to be part of the new Navy—a Navy being built in this shipyard and in shipyards throughout our great country—a new Navy which will give the United States the kind of naval power we shall need in the foreseeable future.

Some 20 years ago, the Navy's amphibious forces sprang into being almost overnight in response to the urgent requirements of the Second World War. Every major campaign of that war began with an amphibious invasion. Every one was successful.

But at the close of that war, some experts said that the advent of nuclear weapons meant the end of amphibious operations—that the Navy would no longer need an amphibious capability.

How wrong they have been. Within 6 years after the end of World War II, we made the large-scale amphibious landing at Inchon which effectively turned the tide in Korea. In the decade following that conflict, our amphibious forces were called on to act in connection with almost every occasion of international tension—at places like Suez, Vietnam, the Tachen Islands, Lebanon, and the Congo. Just a few weeks ago, ships of my Pacific Amphibious Force landed the Marines at Bangkok, Thailand.

The fact is that our ability to deter nuclear war has placed even greater emphasis on our ability also to deter or to resist limited aggression. The fact is that our great Navy-Marine Corps amphibious team is becoming increasingly important in view of the kind of nibbling aggressions to which our adversaries have turned.

Whenever such aggressions occur or are threatened, our amphibious forces can move promptly to the area across the free oceans, unhampered by diplomatic considerations, and supported by the full might of our mobile and powerful fleet.

Often, just being there, over the horizon, we can convince those who contemplate aggression that such an act would be unwise and perhaps self-destructive.

Or we can, at the request of a friendly government, promptly place our combat-ready marines ashore, and support them there indefinitely. We did so at Lebanon, and we kept the peace. We did so more recently in Thailand, and we helped to preserve the integrity of that country's borders.

This capability is, indeed, one of our country's important military assets, and it will continue to be important in the foreseeable future.

Vancouver, and the other new amphibious ships we are building today, will greatly en-

A6994

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 21

hance our Nation's limited-war deterrent power. But if an aggressor should be so unwise as to begin hostilities, these ships will enable us promptly to place American fighting men on the scene, together with their necessary weapons, equipment and supplies, and in such strength that they can effectively deal with the enemy.

Our new amphibious forces will be fast—able to move across a thousand miles of ocean within 48 hours. We will be able to land across the beach or, if the tactical situation dictates, we can strike through the air by helicopter-borne assault, hitting the enemy's flanks, surrounding his defense, interdicting his support, and successfully establishing our fighting marines ashore, following up the airborne assault with heavy logistic and combat support across such beaches as are available.

Vancouver, and her sister ship *Raleigh*, represent the means we need to carry out such operations. These ships combine the most useful characteristics of several other types of amphibious ships. Like the dock landing ships which they resemble, they can carry in their large well deck various types of landing craft. Like amphibious assault ships, their flight decks provide for the operation of troop and cargo-carrying helicopters. Like the attack transport and attack cargo ships, they can carry troops together with their combat equipment and the supplies necessary to support and sustain them ashore.

These ships provide the kind of versatility we need in our amphibious forces. Too many of our present amphibious ships, though still useful, are becoming obsolete in terms of present and future technology. Many of these ships, converted from merchant ships in the early days of World War II, were actually in service before most of the men who serve in them were born.

But ships like *Vancouver* and *Raleigh*, *Iwo Jima* and *Okinawa*, are taking their places. These new ships are a tribute to the wisdom and foresight of American people and of their representatives in the Congress. These ships are part of the American answer to those who promise to bury us.

God forbid that it should come to pass, but some Americans may indeed be buried before the great conflict of our times is ended. And if Americans should fall in defense of freedom, I know that history will say we buried our own, with honor, in heroes' graves, and that we did so as freemen.

These qualities of the American spirit—vision, determination, courage—these qualities are built into this ship.

And these are qualities which Captain Harbert and his officers and men will take into her when, a few months from now, the word is given, "Set the watch."

Let our adversaries take notice that we Americans are always on watch, that we recognize and fully assume our responsibilities to each other and to the great ideals which inspired our forefathers and which today inspire men struggling for freedom throughout the world.

Let those who despise and threaten freedom know that, with God's help, we Americans shall always defend and preserve our freedom, not matter what the cost.

Company Health Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is a

news item reporting a speech by John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., which deserves both thought and action: [From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Sept. 19, 1962]

COMPANY HEALTH AID PLANS URGED FOR PENSIONERS

CHICAGO, September 19.—A business executive whose firm already has adopted the program urged other large companies yesterday to provide health insurance for their retired employees.

John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., a pharmaceutical concern, told the annual convention of the American Hospital Association: "If all major corporations and businesses across the country made similar provisions for retired employees * * * the nature of the national program which we face together might be totally changed."

Connor said that every unit of government which does not now do so should devise adequate plans for taking care of the health needs of its own retired employees. He said:

"It is a national scandal that those most in need of financial help during sickness in their declining years are often women and men who have served faithfully and well for many years on inadequate salaries as teachers, policemen, firemen, and civil servants of all kinds."

Connor said he shares the concern of many physicians that placing the health-care payments for any segment of the population under Federal control represents a dangerous precedent, but he said: "At the same time, I think opponents of the social security approach should ask themselves, in all candor, whether the so-called voluntary solution to the problem is as practical as they like to imagine."

He said that if most corporations and most local and State governments and the Federal Government provided voluntary and contributor insurance for their retired employees, the move "certainly would represent such an appreciable improvement that the remainder of the problem would be more manageable."

Connor said his firm has provided retired employees and their dependents with a hospital and surgical insurance program for the last 4 years, with the company bearing the entire cost.

Hartke Urges All Americans To Accept Personally the Vice President's Chal- lenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on September 18, 1962, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON addressed the United Steelworkers convention in Miami, Fla. His remarks to the delegates and honored guests of the convention were more than inspirational. The Vice President offered a real challenge to America. Every American should accept this challenge personally.

I ask unanimous consent to have our Vice President's remarks printed in the Appendix of the Record, so that all may have the opportunity to read and understand the wisdom of our distinguished and able Vice President, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

(Remarks by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, United Steelworkers Convention, Miami, Fla., Tuesday, September 18, 1962)

President McDonald, delegates, honored guests, being here today is something of a surprise for me. As you know, Arthur Goldberg was supposed to fill this place that I occupy. But at virtually the last minute, Secretary Goldberg found that he had another appointment. I had hardly stepped off the plane that brought me back from the Middle East, when I encountered the Goldberg charm and the Goldberg persistence.

So I find myself here in Miami trying to fill the shoes of a man with whom you have been intimately associated for many years and whom I consider one of the great public servants of our time.

Arthur Goldberg insisted that out of my experiences in the Middle East could come a message that would be meaningful to you. I told him that I did not think you had traveled all the way to Miami to listen to a travelog. But he said that this was not the point. He said, and I agree, that we are living in a world where all who love freedom—regardless of the race, creed, color, or section of origin—are bound together in common interest. In this, he is right, and about this I want to talk today.

SHEPHERDS AND KINGS

Less than 2 weeks ago, I was in a region of the world crucial to the future of freedom—the Middle East. I walked the teeming streets of Ankara and Izmir—and through the bazaars of Tehran and Istanbul. I talked with shepherds in Greece and roadworkers in Lebanon; with shipwrights in Naples and factory workers in Nicosia.

I had specific missions from the President. These required me to discuss points of common interest to the whole free world with presidents and prime ministers and with two kings.

But American foreign policy does not interest itself solely in diplomatic negotiations. We are deeply aware that the opinions of people are ultimately controlling. Therefore, I tried to learn from both the high and the low—from royalty in Greece and from a boy peddling watermelons in Beirut.

CRUCIAL REGION

It is difficult to find an area of the world of greater importance to the long-range interest of the United States and of freedom. The Middle East represents the cradle of Western civilization. The Middle East is where we first drew the line against communism after World War II—and that line has yet to be denied. The Middle East represents a vital flank of the NATO shield against aggression.

The major Middle Eastern nations that I visited have dedicated themselves to preserving their independence at any cost and have backed their determination with men and resources. No sensible man would pretend that he had become an expert on this area of the world in a visit that lasted less than 3 weeks. Nevertheless, there are certain impressions that I wish to share with you—because they have a direct bearing upon our problems.

THE BRIGHT HOPE

First, the so-called ugly American has made very little impression upon the people of the world—if he exists at all.

The throngs that turned out by hundreds of thousands to greet me in virtually every country certainly did not turn out to see LYNDON JOHNSON. They did turn out because I was there representing the United States which remains the bright hope of hundreds of millions throughout the world.